

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of: Jeff EDER

Application No.: 10/821,504

Confirmation No: 9808

Art Unit: 3692

Examiner: Sigfried Chencinski

Filed: April 9, 2004

For: Business activity management system

LETTER

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir or Madam:

Under the provisions of MPEP § 2001.06(b), the Examiner is hereby advised of the December 4, 2007 Office Action for copending application 10/441,385 a copy of which is attached hereto.

The above-listed co-pending application(s) is(are) not to be construed as prior art. By bringing the above-listed application(s) to the attention of the Examiner, Applicant(s) does NOT waive any confidentiality concerning the above-listed co-pending application(s) or this application. See MPEP § 101. Furthermore, if said application(s) should not mature into patents, such application(s) should be preserved in secrecy under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 122 and 37 C.F.R. § 1.14.

Dated: April 13, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

/B.J. Bennett/

B.J. Bennett, President
Asset Reliance, Inc.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
1515 RINGDEN DRIVE, S.W.
SUITE 400
ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22304-3439
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | LIST NAME/INVENTOR | ATTORNEY/AGENCY | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|--------------------|------------------|------------------|
| 10/210,987 | 05/16/2002 | LEE, Seung-Pil | | 74113 |
| 12/04/2007 | | | EXAMINER | |
| ANSEL TRUST, INC. 2120 MOUNTAIN ROAD SUITE 100 BOYD, WA 98021 | | | CHECK MARK SHEET | |
| | | | EXCISE | EXCISE NUMBER |
| | | | 8041 | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | RECEIVED DATE |
| | | | 12/04/2007 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

| | |
|------------------------|------------------|
| Application No. | Applicant(s) |
| 10346,034 | EDER, JEFF SCOTT |
| Examiner | Art Unit |
| Sigfried E. Chencinski | 3692 |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 2 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(b). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, then a minimum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the time extended either for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any shortened period available. See 37 CFR 1.136(d).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 August & 10 November 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 52-55 is/are pending in the application.
- a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 52-55 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheets, including the correction, is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a) (d); or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some c) ☐ None of:
- 1) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
- 2) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____
- 3) ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachments:

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Citations/Supplemental Patent Drawing Review (PTO-456)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-9B/308)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2/26/07 2/23/07 1/21/07
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

1. Applicant has submitted 190 IDS documents for consideration since the examiner's last Office Action. The examiner has not considered these submissions because he is unable to consider this volume of IDS material. Therefore, the examiner requests Applicant's cooperation in this prosecution under MPEP 609.04(a) III, last paragraph, that Applicant submit a "concise explanation of why the English-language information is being submitted and how it is understood to be relevant. Concise explanations (especially those which point out the relevant pages and lines) which are helpful to the Office" will be helpful for any ongoing prosecution of this application.

Double Patenting

2. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *in re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *in re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *in re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *in re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *in re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *in re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 183 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to

be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

3. Claims 69, 79 and 88 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over copending Application No. 09/994,740 (ProGrant Publication 2004/0215551 A1). This is a provisional double patenting rejection since the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claims 69, 79 and 88 in the application and independent claims 1 and 27 in the copending application are each concerned with a computer-based method for determining the financial market value for the components of a business enterprise, assessing the financial impact of risk and developing options for enhancing the future financial value of management decisions.

4. Claims 69, 79 and 88 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,393,406 and claims 1 and 12 of U.S. Patent No. 6,393,406. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claim 1 in the application and the independent claims in the patents are each concerned with a computer-based method for determining the financial market value for the components of a business enterprise, assessing the financial impact of risk and developing options for enhancing the future financial value of management decisions.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

5. **Claims 69-95 are rejected** because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 69, 79 and 88 are not directed to any one of the areas of patentable subject matter, such as product, process, process of making or composition. Dependent claims 70-79, 80-87 and 89-95 are rejected because of their dependence on independent claim 1. In other words, claims 69, 79 and 88 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is not supported by either a clearly asserted utility or a well established utility.

For a claim to be statutory under 35 USC 101 the following two conditions must be met:

1) In the claim, the practical application of an algorithm or idea results in a useful, concrete, tangible result.

In the instant application, the independent claims fail to produce a useful, concrete or tangible result because the method steps end with the performance of a financial simulation which is left unused and unapplied. In other words, it is merely an esoteric exercise without a practical application.

Applicant is advised to satisfy the statutory requirements for the claims. Applicant is also advised not to add any new matter to the specification or the claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

6. **Claims 69-95 are also rejected** under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Specifically, since the claimed invention is not supported by either a clearly asserted utility or a well established utility for the reasons set forth above, one skilled in the art clearly would not know how to use the claimed invention. Ordinary practitioners would not be able to achieve repeatable results and thus is not concrete. The invention cannot

achieve repeatable results because its implementation requires many subjective judgments and has so many parameters that that results cannot be repeated independently

7. **Claims 69-95 are also rejected** under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the best mode contemplated by the inventor has not been disclosed. Evidence of concealment of the best mode is based upon the fact that no best mode is found in the specification (MPEP 2106-IV.C.2(2)c)

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

"The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention."

8. **Claims 69-95 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph**, as being incomplete for omitting essential elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the elements. See MPEP § 2172.01. The omitted elements are the steps which would lead an ordinary practitioner of the art to successfully apply the invention to produce a concrete, reproducible quantitative valuation result of a firm. For example, Independent claims 69, 79 and 88 claim program storage devices readable by a computer and a method for integrated performance management, measuring of financial performance and flexible integration for brand risk management without including one or more clear means for showing the ordinary practitioner how to implement the invention.

9. **Independent claims 69, 79 and 88 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph**, because these claims recite the limitation "brand risk management in the preamble and in the first limitation of each claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in those independent claims. Further, the examiner has been unable to find broader descriptions in the specification which reasonably link risk management to brand risk management.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. **Claims 69-95 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sandretto (US Patent 5,812,988).**

Re. Claims 69-95, Sandretto discloses a computer implemented method and apparatus for: (1) inputting economic variables expected to influence future asset values and asset-specific variables; (2) estimating financial statements, future asset values, and tentative asset NPVs using estimated economic variables and estimated asset-specific variables; (3) estimating different financial statements, future asset values and current asset NPVs assuming different estimates of the economic variables that affect asset values; and (4) processes to: (a) equate; or (2) reduce to acceptably small numbers the differences between: (i) the risk measures, terminal values, default premiums, and risk premiums used to determine current values, and (ii) risk measures, terminal values, default premiums, and risk premiums implied by the estimates of economic and firm-specific variables (Abstract). Sandretto's teaching includes a program storage device readable by a computer, tangibly embodying a program of instructions executable by at least one computer to perform the steps of his method (Col. 14, ll. 30-32). Sandretto implicitly discloses a performance management system for a multi business unit organization, including means for integrating narrow performance data from business units in accordance with an organization matrix determining value contributions, creating scenarios, determining elements of value, determining optimization scenarios, and communicating the optimal features mix to the narrow systems implementation. Sandretto teaches risk management in his method in the title, in the abstract and throughout his specification. It would have been obvious to an ordinary practitioner of the art at the time of Applicant's invention that Sandretto's

risk management teachings could be applied to numerous value parameters of an enterprise, including brand risk management since applicant's claimed invention includes the variables understood by an ordinary practitioner in a large corporation having numerous business units to be used in risk assessed financial valuations and forecasts for such a corporation. Therefore, an ordinary practitioner of the art at the time of Applicant's invention would have seen it as obvious to have used Sandretto's disclosures for the purpose of developing an integrated brand risk management systems, methods and a program storage device for a multi-enterprise organization, motivated by a desire to offer an improved method for estimating asset values (Col. 2, ll. 2-65).

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's arguments received on August 25, 2007 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

11. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Siegfried Chencinski whose telephone number is

Art. Unit: 3582

(571) 272-6792. The Examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday, 9am to 6pm.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Alexander Kainowski, can be reached on (571) 272-6771.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington D.C. 20231


or Faxed to (571) 273-8300 [Official communications, including After Final communications labeled "Box AF"]

or Faxed to (571) 273-6792 [Informal/Draft communications, labeled "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT"]

Hand delivered responses should be brought to the address found on the above USPTO web site in Alexandria, VA.

SFC

November 29, 2007


NARAYANSWAMY SUBRAMANIAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Source: U.S. Department of Energy, Energy Information Administration, *Annual Energy Review*, 1997, Table A-1.1.

Received 1997-05-14; revised 1997-09-04; accepted 1997-10-01.

1. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 1997; 277: 1039-1043.

INFORMATION DISCLOSURE
STATEMENT BY APPLICANT

—Life as busy as this is not a bad thing

Complete if Known

| | |
|-----------------------|--------------------|
| Application Number | 10048194 |
| Filing Date | 11/18/2002 |
| First named inventor | Jeff S. Elder |
| Attorney | 2692 |
| Examiner Notes | Signed Off enclose |
| Attorney Telex Number | APR - 34 |

NON-PATENT LITERATURE DOCUMENTS

| Excerpt Number | Cite No. | include name of the author or U.S. TITLE EARS, identify the title (when appropriate) title of the item (book, magazine, journal, serial, symposium, catalog, etc.), date, page(s), volume/issue number(s), publisher, city and/or country where published | T |
|-------------------|-------------|---|---|
| 127 | | ROLL, RICHARD. "A Mean/Variance Analysis of Tracking Error", pages 13 - 22, V'8, Summer 1992. Journal of Portfolio Management, J.S.A. | |
| 128 | | UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND UNIVERSITY COLLEGE. "Intelligent Agents and how they are changing our learning", UMUC website, August 20, 2009 | |

| | |
|----------------------------|------------------------------|
| Examiner S. J. B. B. B. | Date Completed 11/2/07 |
|----------------------------|------------------------------|

¹ The authors are grateful to the referees for their valuable comments and suggestions.

[illegible]

Downloaded from ascelibrary.org by University of California, Berkeley on 06/01/14. Copyright ASCE. For personal use only; all rights reserved.

Received 8/8/2002

10/15
10/15

PTO 60-100-0003
Application for Issuance of a Patent Under 35 U.S.C. 3510-3513
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
This form is to be filled out by the applicant and filed with the application. It contains a statement of the applicant's knowledge of the prior art and a statement of the applicant's belief that the invention is novel and non-obvious.

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Complete if known

INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT BY APPLICANT

See secondary sheets if necessary.

Sheet

of

Application Number

10044-094

Filing Date

01/16/2002

First Named Inventor

Jeff S. Ecker

Art Unit

3202

Examiner Name

Sigfried Chencinski

Agency Control Number

App. 44

NON PATENT LITERATURE DOCUMENTS

| Examiner Initials | Cite No. | Include name of the author (in CAPITAL LETTERS), title of the item (book, magazine, journal, symposium, catalog, etc.), date, page(s), volume, issue number(s), publisher, city and/or country where published. | T ² |
|----------------------|-------------|---|----------------|
| | 1 | ZIPP, ALAN S., Business valuation methods, 1993, pages 1 - 215, AICPA, U.S.A. | |
| | 2 | DAVIDOW, WILLIAM, Accounting systems are completely wrong, Real Hacking, January 1, 1995, pages 1 - 3, Real Hacking, U.S.A. | |
| | 3 | MOTAGGERI, JAMES, KUN, L.S., PETER AND MANKINS, MICHAEL, The value imperative, 1994, pages 1 - 152, The Free Press, U.S.A. | |
| | 4 | RAPPAPORT, ALFRED, Creating shareholder value, 1995 & 1998, pages 1 - 195, The Free Press, U.S.A. | |
| | 5 | RITCHKEN, PETER, Option Theory, Strategy and Applications, 1987, pages 1 - 407, Prentice Hall, U.S.A. | |
| | 6 | DIXIT, AVINASH & PINDYCK, ROBERT, Investment under uncertainty, 1994, pages 2 - 444, Princeton University Press, U.S.A. | |
| | 7 | GARSON, DAVID, Interpreting neural network connection weights, 4/1/1997, pages 47 - 51, AI Expert, U.S.A. | |
| | 8 | WELLSTEAD, STEPHEN, Neural network and fuzzy logic applications in C/C++, 1994, pages 3 - 447, John Wiley & Sons, U.S.A. | |
| | 9 | MOS, KENNETH, Accounting theory, 1977, pages 1 - 148, G.K. Inc., U.S.A. | |
| | 10 | HENDRIKSLIN, BLAIR, Accounting theory, 1982, pages 1 - 524, Richard D. Irwin, U.S.A. | |

Examiner
Signature

[Signature]

Date

10/16/02

1. I am the inventor of the invention described in the application, or I am the assignee of the application, or I am the owner of the application.

2. I am the inventor of the invention described in the application, or I am the assignee of the application, or I am the owner of the application.

3. I am the inventor of the invention described in the application, or I am the assignee of the application, or I am the owner of the application.

4. I am the inventor of the invention described in the application, or I am the assignee of the application, or I am the owner of the application.

5. I am the inventor of the invention described in the application, or I am the assignee of the application, or I am the owner of the application.

6. I am the inventor of the invention described in the application, or I am the assignee of the application, or I am the owner of the application.

7. I am the inventor of the invention described in the application, or I am the assignee of the application, or I am the owner of the application.

8. I am the inventor of the invention described in the application, or I am the assignee of the application, or I am the owner of the application.

9. I am the inventor of the invention described in the application, or I am the assignee of the application, or I am the owner of the application.

10. I am the inventor of the invention described in the application, or I am the assignee of the application, or I am the owner of the application.

11. I am the inventor of the invention described in the application, or I am the assignee of the application, or I am the owner of the application.

12. I am the inventor of the invention described in the application, or I am the assignee of the application, or I am the owner of the application.

13. I am the inventor of the invention described in the application, or I am the assignee of the application, or I am the owner of the application.

14. I am the inventor of the invention described in the application, or I am the assignee of the application, or I am the owner of the application.

15. I am the inventor of the invention described in the application, or I am the assignee of the application, or I am the owner of the application.

16. I am the inventor of the invention described in the application, or I am the assignee of the application, or I am the owner of the application.

17. I am the inventor of the invention described in the application, or I am the assignee of the application, or I am the owner of the application.

18. I am the inventor of the invention described in the application, or I am the assignee of the application, or I am the owner of the application.

4/15

Substitute for form 1449PTO

INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT BY APPLICANT

(Use as many sheets as necessary)

Complete if Known

| | |
|------------------------|---------------------|
| Application Number | 0186,758 |
| Filing Date | 03/12/2002 |
| First Named Inventor | Jeff S. Eder |
| Art Unit | 3623 |
| Examiner Name | Sigfried Chencinski |
| Attorney Docket Number | AR-44 |

| NON PATENT LITERATURE DOCUMENTS | | | |
|---------------------------------|----------|---|----------------|
| Examiner Initials* | Cite No. | Include name of the author (in CAPITAL LETTERS), title of the article (when appropriate), title of the item (book, magazine, journal, serial, symposium, catalog, etc.), date, page(s) volume/issue number(s), publisher, city and/or country where published | T ² |
| 31 | 31 | HIRSCH, A. ETHAN, What's it worth? December 21, 1992, page 16, V6, Accounting Today, U.S.A. | |
| | 32 | MYERS, STEWART & HOWE, CHR STOPHER: A life-cycle financial model of Pharmaceutical R&D; April 1997; pages 1 - 38, MIT Sloan School of Management, USA | |
| | 33 | S MON, CAROL J. & SULLIVAN, MARY W.; The Measurement and Determinants of Brand Equity, Winter 1993; pages 26 - 52, V12, Marketing Science, U.S.A. | |
| | 34 | SVEIBY, KARL & MELLANDER-KLAR, Bengt Learning Guide Version 2.1; 1994; pages 4 - 50, Celem, Sweden | |
| | 35 | KAUFMAN, J. JERRY; Value Management; 1988; pages 1 - 60, Crisp Publications, U.S.A. | |
| | 36 | HBS Press, Harvard Business Review on Measuring Corporate Performance 1998; pages 1 - 216, HBS Press, U.S.A. | |
| | 37 | KAPLAN, ROBERT & NORTON, DAVID The Balanced Scorecard; 1998; pages 1 - 311 HBS Press, U.S.A. | |
| | 38 | MORRIS, HENRY, Extending the Business Process, October 6, 1998, slides 1 - 20, IDC Presentation, San Francisco, CA, U.S.A. | |
| | 39 | AMIR, ELI & LEV BARUCH, "Value-relevance of non-financial information", August - December 1996, pages 3 - 30, Journal of Accounting and Economics, U.S.A. | |
| | 40 | ERNST & YOUNG, Measuring that Matter, 1997, pages 1 - 16 Ernst & Young Center for Business Innovation, U.S.A. | |

| | |
|--------------------|-----------------|
| Examiner Signature | Date Considered |
| <i>[Signature]</i> | 4/17/02 |

*EXAMINER, initial the reference information, whether or not utilized in an examination, with MPKP 005. Consistent through the entire examination and not to be changed. The applicant must complete this form with documentation to be submitted to the examiner.
 *Examiner, on a separate sheet, must indicate the date of the document to be used as a check mark (see "English Language Translation is Required" for details on this requirement).
 *The submission of information is required by 37 CFR 1.98. The information must be submitted to the examiner in a form that is acceptable to the USPTO to be used in an examination. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.14. The applicant is responsible to take 120 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. This varies depending upon the individual case. Any comments or the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or objections for reasons for burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, Washington, DC 20231. DO NOT SEND PAPER COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, Washington, DC 20231.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-6192, 1-800-786-1959 and select option 2.

INFORMATION DISCLOSURE
STATEMENT BY APPLICANT

[illegible]

Complete if known

| | |
|--------------------|-----------|
| Application Number | 19365 094 |
|--------------------|-----------|

| | |
|-------------|------------|
| Filing Date | 31/10/2007 |
|-------------|------------|

| | |
|----------------------|----------|
| First Named Inventor | J. G. F. |
|----------------------|----------|

| | |
|--------|----------|
| Set Up | End Date |
|--------|----------|

| | |
|-----------------|-------------------|
| Phone: 441 3374 | Sigfred Chelchsky |
|-----------------|-------------------|

| | |
|----------------------------|---------|
| Alumina, 200 g/L (4.000 g) | 5.000 g |
|----------------------------|---------|

NON PATENT LITERATURE DOCUMENTS

| Source | Cite | Include name of the author (if it is different from the title and, when appropriate, title of the item) (i.e., magazine, journal, etc., by whom published, etc., date, page(s), volume(issue), number, etc. if any) (country, where published) |
|--------|------|--|
| 1 | 2 | 3 |

BOUQUET, F., OLIO, S., RABINOVITZ, L., et al., Modeling and Using Context 1999-1998, pages 1-826 Springer Germany.

AKMAN, VAROL, BOUQUET, PAOLO, et al; Modeling and Using Context - Context 2001, 2001, pages 1 - 489, Springer, Germany

43. KUTCHER, SYDNEY and SEIGAL, Carolyn, *earr ng progress in abstraction using structural methods*, *Artificial Intelligence* 1980, pages 170-171. Proceedings of 22nd Annual Cognitive Science Conference Philadelphia, P.A. U.S.A.

FRANKE, JURGEN, HARDLE, WOLFGANG, et al. *Measuring Risk in Complex Stochastic Systems*; 2000, pages 1-255 Springer, U.S.A.

45 SHIMPI, PRAKASH, Integrating Corporate Risk Management, 1999 & 2001, pages 3 - 33, Lexere, LLC USA

26 BREWKA, GERHARD Principles of Knowledge Representation, 1993 pages 1-311
OE Foundation, Springfield, IL, USA

REIFER, RAYMOND. *Knowledge in Action*. 2001, pages 1 - 418. MIT Press, U.S.A.

48 TOSSEN RENE ANDRIESEN DANIEL, et al., The Knowledge Division, 2000, pages 3
- 59, Prentice Hall, U.K.

49 BROWN JOHN SEELY, *et al.*, 'Assessing Co-Flow process networks to boost the power of specialization', 2002, pages 59-60, McKinsey Quarterly Special Edition, McKinsey, USA

50 D.-Y. HUI, JIM "An Integrated Environment for Knowledge Acquisition", 2001, pages 13-29. Proceedings International Conference on Intelligent User Interfaces, ACM, U.S.A.

Examine
Structure

1. $\frac{1}{2}$ 2. $\frac{1}{3}$ 3. $\frac{1}{4}$ 4. $\frac{1}{5}$ 5. $\frac{1}{6}$ 6. $\frac{1}{7}$ 7. $\frac{1}{8}$ 8. $\frac{1}{9}$ 9. $\frac{1}{10}$ 10. $\frac{1}{11}$ 11. $\frac{1}{12}$ 12. $\frac{1}{13}$ 13. $\frac{1}{14}$ 14. $\frac{1}{15}$ 15. $\frac{1}{16}$ 16. $\frac{1}{17}$ 17. $\frac{1}{18}$ 18. $\frac{1}{19}$ 19. $\frac{1}{20}$ 20. $\frac{1}{21}$ 21. $\frac{1}{22}$ 22. $\frac{1}{23}$ 23. $\frac{1}{24}$ 24. $\frac{1}{25}$ 25. $\frac{1}{26}$ 26. $\frac{1}{27}$ 27. $\frac{1}{28}$ 28. $\frac{1}{29}$ 29. $\frac{1}{30}$ 30. $\frac{1}{31}$ 31. $\frac{1}{32}$ 32. $\frac{1}{33}$ 33. $\frac{1}{34}$ 34. $\frac{1}{35}$ 35. $\frac{1}{36}$ 36. $\frac{1}{37}$ 37. $\frac{1}{38}$ 38. $\frac{1}{39}$ 39. $\frac{1}{40}$ 40. $\frac{1}{41}$ 41. $\frac{1}{42}$ 42. $\frac{1}{43}$ 43. $\frac{1}{44}$ 44. $\frac{1}{45}$ 45. $\frac{1}{46}$ 46. $\frac{1}{47}$ 47. $\frac{1}{48}$ 48. $\frac{1}{49}$ 49. $\frac{1}{50}$ 50. $\frac{1}{51}$ 51. $\frac{1}{52}$ 52. $\frac{1}{53}$ 53. $\frac{1}{54}$ 54. $\frac{1}{55}$ 55. $\frac{1}{56}$ 56. $\frac{1}{57}$ 57. $\frac{1}{58}$ 58. $\frac{1}{59}$ 59. $\frac{1}{60}$ 60. $\frac{1}{61}$ 61. $\frac{1}{62}$ 62. $\frac{1}{63}$ 63. $\frac{1}{64}$ 64. $\frac{1}{65}$ 65. $\frac{1}{66}$ 66. $\frac{1}{67}$ 67. $\frac{1}{68}$ 68. $\frac{1}{69}$ 69. $\frac{1}{70}$ 70. $\frac{1}{71}$ 71. $\frac{1}{72}$ 72. $\frac{1}{73}$ 73. $\frac{1}{74}$ 74. $\frac{1}{75}$ 75. $\frac{1}{76}$ 76. $\frac{1}{77}$ 77. $\frac{1}{78}$ 78. $\frac{1}{79}$ 79. $\frac{1}{80}$ 80. $\frac{1}{81}$ 81. $\frac{1}{82}$ 82. $\frac{1}{83}$ 83. $\frac{1}{84}$ 84. $\frac{1}{85}$ 85. $\frac{1}{86}$ 86. $\frac{1}{87}$ 87. $\frac{1}{88}$ 88. $\frac{1}{89}$ 89. $\frac{1}{90}$ 90. $\frac{1}{91}$ 91. $\frac{1}{92}$ 92. $\frac{1}{93}$ 93. $\frac{1}{94}$ 94. $\frac{1}{95}$ 95. $\frac{1}{96}$ 96. $\frac{1}{97}$ 97. $\frac{1}{98}$ 98. $\frac{1}{99}$ 99. $\frac{1}{100}$ 100. $\frac{1}{101}$ 101. $\frac{1}{102}$ 102. $\frac{1}{103}$ 103. $\frac{1}{104}$ 104. $\frac{1}{105}$ 105. $\frac{1}{106}$ 106. $\frac{1}{107}$ 107. $\frac{1}{108}$ 108. $\frac{1}{109}$ 109. $\frac{1}{110}$ 110. $\frac{1}{111}$ 111. $\frac{1}{112}$ 112. $\frac{1}{113}$ 113. $\frac{1}{114}$ 114. $\frac{1}{115}$ 115. $\frac{1}{116}$ 116. $\frac{1}{117}$ 117. $\frac{1}{118}$ 118. $\frac{1}{119}$ 119. $\frac{1}{120}$ 120. $\frac{1}{121}$ 121. $\frac{1}{122}$ 122. $\frac{1}{123}$ 123. $\frac{1}{124}$ 124. $\frac{1}{125}$ 125. $\frac{1}{126}$ 126. $\frac{1}{127}$ 127. $\frac{1}{128}$ 128. $\frac{1}{129}$ 129. $\frac{1}{130}$ 130. $\frac{1}{131}$ 131. $\frac{1}{132}$ 132. $\frac{1}{133}$ 133. $\frac{1}{134}$ 134. $\frac{1}{135}$ 135. $\frac{1}{136}$ 136. $\frac{1}{137}$ 137. $\frac{1}{138}$ 138. $\frac{1}{139}$ 139. $\frac{1}{140}$ 140. $\frac{1}{141}$ 141. $\frac{1}{142}$ 142. $\frac{1}{143}$ 143. $\frac{1}{144}$ 144. $\frac{1}{145}$ 145. $\frac{1}{146}$ 146. $\frac{1}{147}$ 147. $\frac{1}{148}$ 148. $\frac{1}{149}$ 149. $\frac{1}{150}$ 150. $\frac{1}{151}$ 151. $\frac{1}{152}$ 152. $\frac{1}{153}$ 153. $\frac{1}{154}$ 154. $\frac{1}{155}$ 155. $\frac{1}{156}$ 156. $\frac{1}{157}$ 157. $\frac{1}{158}$ 158. $\frac{1}{159}$ 159. $\frac{1}{160}$ 160. $\frac{1}{161}$ 161. $\frac{1}{162}$ 162. $\frac{1}{163}$ 163. $\frac{1}{164}$ 164. $\frac{1}{165}$ 165. $\frac{1}{166}$ 166. $\frac{1}{167}$ 167. $\frac{1}{168}$ 168. $\frac{1}{169}$ 169. $\frac{1}{170}$ 170. $\frac{1}{171}$ 171. $\frac{1}{172}$ 172. $\frac{1}{173}$ 173. $\frac{1}{174}$ 174. $\frac{1}{175}$ 175. $\frac{1}{176}$ 176. $\frac{1}{177}$ 177. $\frac{1}{178}$ 178. $\frac{1}{179}$ 179. $\frac{1}{180}$ 180. $\frac{1}{181}$ 181. $\frac{1}{182}$ 182. $\frac{1}{183}$ 183. $\frac{1}{184}$ 184. $\frac{1}{185}$ 185. $\frac{1}{186}$ 186. $\frac{1}{187}$ 187. $\frac{1}{188}$ 188. $\frac{1}{189}$ 189. $\frac{1}{190}$ 190. $\frac{1}{191}$ 191. $\frac{1}{192}$ 192. $\frac{1}{193}$ 193. $\frac{1}{194}$ 194. $\frac{1}{195}$ 195. $\frac{1}{196}$ 196. $\frac{1}{197}$ 197. $\frac{1}{198}$ 198. $\frac{1}{199}$ 199. $\frac{1}{200}$ 200. $\frac{1}{201}$ 201. $\frac{1}{202}$ 202. $\frac{1}{203}$ 203. $\frac{1}{204}$ 204. $\frac{1}{205}$ 205. $\frac{1}{206}$ 206. $\frac{1}{207}$ 207. $\frac{1}{208}$ 208. $\frac{1}{209}$ 209. $\frac{1}{210}$ 210. $\frac{1}{211}$ 211. $\frac{1}{212}$ 212. $\frac{1}{213}$ 213. $\frac{1}{214}$ 214. $\frac{1}{215}$ 215. $\frac{1}{216}$ 216. $\frac{1}{217}$ 217. $\frac{1}{218}$ 218. $\frac{1}{219}$ 219. $\frac{1}{220}$ 220. $\frac{1}{221}$ 221. $\frac{1}{222}$ 222. $\frac{1}{223}$ 223. $\frac{1}{224}$ 224. $\frac{1}{225}$ 225. $\frac{1}{226}$ 226. $\frac{1}{227}$ 227. $\frac{1}{228}$ 228. $\frac{1}{229}$ 229. $\frac{1}{230}$ 230. $\frac{1}{231}$ 231. $\frac{1}{232}$ 232. $\frac{1}{233}$ 233. $\frac{1}{234}$ 234. $\frac{1}{235}$ 235. $\frac{1}{236}$ 236. $\frac{1}{237}$ 237. $\frac{1}{238}$ 238. $\frac{1}{239}$ 239. $\frac{1}{240}$ 240.

[illegible]

7/15

8. Submit the form 1449-PTO

INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT BY APPLICANT

(Use as many sheets as necessary.)

Complete if Known

| | |
|-----------------------|---------------------|
| Application Number | 10/046,094 |
| Filing Date | 01/16/2002 |
| First Named Inventor | Jeff S. Edel |
| Applicant | 3952 |
| Examiner Name | Sgtfried Chancinski |
| Attorney/Agent Number | ARI - 44 |

| NON-PATENT LITERATURE DOCUMENTS | | | |
|---------------------------------|------------|---|-----|
| Examiner's Notation * | Cite No. 1 | Include name of the author (in CAPITAL LETTERS), title of the article (when appropriate), title of the journal (book, magazine, journal, serial, symposium, catalog, etc.), date (page/s), volume (issue number/s), publisher, city, and/or country, where published. | T 2 |
| | 61 | CLLP, CHRISTOPHER et al. "Value at Risk for Asset Managers" Derivatives Quarterly, January 8, 1999, pages 22 - 33, v. 5, New York, U.S.A. | |
| | 62 | CHICAGO MERCANTILE EXCHANGE, "SPAN - Frequently Asked Questions", CME web site, 2/17/2006, FAO pages 1 - 4, U.S.A. | |
| | 63 | CHICAGO BOARD OF TRADE, "SPAN Margin System", August 27, 1991, pages 1 - 72, Chicago Board of Trade, U.S.A. | |
| | 64 | W3C, "Extensible Markup Language (XML)", W3C web site archives, pages 1 - 5, April 1999 | |
| | 65 | GOLDFARB, CHARLES & PRESCOTT, PAUL, XML Handbook, 1998, pages 20 - 37, Prentice Hall, U.S.A. | |
| | 66 | MAIER, DAVID, "Database Desiderata for an XML Query Language", W3C web site archives, pages 1 - 6, March 2001 | |
| | 67 | WIDOM, JENNIFER, "Data Management for XML", Research Directions, September 1999, pages 44 - 52, V22, IEEE Data Engineering Bulletin, Special Issue on XML, U.S.A. | |
| | 68 | CHAMBERS, ROBERT GUIGGINS, JOHN, "Resource Allocation and Asset Pricing", pages 1 - 29, November 2002, University of Maryland Working Paper 02-20, U.S.A. | |
| | 69 | HASENDONCKS, MICHEL, "VDM - Value Driven Trees" June 8 2005, SAP Corporate Performance Monitoring Seminar, Belgium | |
| | 70 | BARUA AN TESH, LEE, C.H. SOPHIE WHINSTON, ANDREW, "The Calculus of Reengineering", August 1996, pages 408 - 428, V7, Information Systems Research, U.S.A. | |

| | |
|---|-----------------|
| Examiner's Signature | Date Considered |
|  | 11/17/07 |

*EXAMINER: Should refer to numbered document or reference in the information with MPER (C) Draw line through citation if not in document and if, possible, include copy of the form with next communication to applicant.
 1. Applicant's flow number and/or prior number(s). 2. Applicant's flow number(s) if the flow number(s) is/are attached.
 3. Applicant's flow number(s) if the flow number(s) is/are attached.
 4. Applicant's flow number(s) if the flow number(s) is/are attached.
 5. Applicant's flow number(s) if the flow number(s) is/are attached.
 6. Applicant's flow number(s) if the flow number(s) is/are attached.
 7. Applicant's flow number(s) if the flow number(s) is/are attached.
 8. Applicant's flow number(s) if the flow number(s) is/are attached.
 9. Applicant's flow number(s) if the flow number(s) is/are attached.
 10. Applicant's flow number(s) if the flow number(s) is/are attached.

For more information in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9191 (1-800-786-9191) and select option 2

INFORMATION DISCLOSURE
STATEMENT BY APPLICANT[illegible]

Complete if Known

| | |
|-------------------------|-------------------|
| Application Number | 13/045,094 |
| Filing Date | 11/16/2002 |
| First Named Inventor | Jeff S. Eder |
| Art Unit | 3692 |
| Examiner Name | Sigfried Ghendesk |
| Apparatus Docket Number | AP-44 |

NON PATENT LITERATURE DOCUMENTS

| Exemption number | Site no | Include name of the author (in CAPITAL LETTERS), title of the article (when appropriate), name of the item (book, magazine, journal, serial, symposium, working, etc.), date, page's, volume/issue number(s), publisher, city and/or country where published | P |
|---------------------|------------|--|---|
| | 71 | BAGHAJ, MEHRDAD, COLEY, STEPHEN & WHITE, DAVID, "The Achemy of Growth", 1998, pages 2-244, Harcourt Brace, U.S.A. | |
| | 72 | BRISYS, ERIC DE VARENNE, FRANCOIS, Insurance from underwriting to derivatives 2001, pages 1-184, John Wiley and Sons, Inc., U.S.A. | |
| | 73 | Anonymous "The future of finance", The Economist, December 11, 1999, pages 71-73, U.S.A. | |
| | 74 | DOWD, KEVIN, Beyond Value at Risk 1998, pages 3-269, John Wiley & Sons, U.S.A. | |
| | 75 | THE APPRAISAL FOUNDATION, Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice 97, 1997, pages 55-61, The Appraisal Foundation, U.S.A. | |
| | 76 | MAUBOUSSIN, MICHAEL, "Get Real", June 23, 1999, pages 3-30, Credit Suisse First Boston, U.S.A. | |
| | 77 | SIEGEL, JEREMY, "The Noisy Market Hypothesis", June 14, 2003, page A14, The Wall Street Journal, U.S.A. | |
| | 78 | EDER, JEFF, Hard facts about soft assets (and real options), April 3, 2001, pages 1-184, Casualty Actuary Society Seminar on Enterprise Risk Management, U.S.A. | |
| | 79 | FARQUHAR, PETER & FAN, JULIE, "Recognizing and measuring your brand assets", July 1991, pages 1-29, Report 91-195, Marketing Science Institute, U.S.A. | |
| | 80 | HULL, JOHN C., Options, futures and other derivatives, 2000, pages 1-371, Prentice Hall, U.S.A. | |

| | | | |
|------------------------|--------------------|------|----------|
| Evaluator Signature | <i>[Signature]</i> | Date | 11/17/07 |
|------------------------|--------------------|------|----------|

[illegible]

DOI: 10.1002/for

Complete if known

| | |
|--------------------|------------|
| Application Number | 10/046 034 |
|--------------------|------------|

| | |
|--------------------|------------|
| Application Number | 10/046 034 |
|--------------------|------------|

| | |
|--------------------|------------|
| Application Number | 10/046 034 |
|--------------------|------------|

| | |
|-------------|-----------|
| Filing Date | 3/11/2000 |
|-------------|-----------|

| | |
|-------------|-----------|
| Filing Date | 3/11/2000 |
|-------------|-----------|

| | |
|----------------------|--------------|
| First Named Inventor | John S. Felt |
|----------------------|--------------|

| | |
|----------------------|--------------|
| First Named Inventor | John S. Felt |
|----------------------|--------------|

| | |
|----------|------|
| Art Ulog | 9892 |
|----------|------|

| | |
|----------|------|
| Art Ulog | 9892 |
|----------|------|

| | |
|---------------|-----------|
| Examiner Name | Jeff Egan |
|---------------|-----------|

| | |
|---------------|-----------|
| Examiner Name | Jeff Egan |
|---------------|-----------|

| | |
|----------------------|---------|
| Alimony Date: Number | AP - 44 |
|----------------------|---------|

| | |
|----------------------|---------|
| Alimony Date: Number | AP - 44 |
|----------------------|---------|

| Event/Item Initials* | Cite No. | Includes name of the author (in CAPITAL LETTERS), title of the article (when appropriate), title of the journal (book, magazine, journal, serial, symposium, etc.), date, page(s), volume/issue number(s), publisher, city and/or country where published. | T? |
|----------------------|----------|--|----|
| | 81 | KLUGE, JURGEN, STEIN, WOLFRAM, LICHT, THOMAS, Knowledge Unplugged, 2001, pages 3 - 207, Praeger, U.K. | |
| | 82 | QUINN, JAMES BRIAN, Intelligent Enterprise, 1992, pages 3 - 456, The Free Press, U.S.A. | |
| | 83 | FOWLER, MARTIN, Analysis Patterns: Reusable Object Models, 1997, pages 1 - 342, Addison-Wesley, U.S.A. | |
| | 84 | SHAFER, GLENN & VOVK, VLADIMIR, Probability and Finance 2001, pages 1 - 404, John Wiley & Sons, U.S.A. | |
| | 85 | FAHY, MARTIN, Strategic Enterprise Management Systems, 2002, pages 1 - 77, ACPA, U.S.A. | |
| | 86 | CAQUETTE, JOHN, ALTMAN, EDWARD & NAKAYANAN, PAUL, Managing Credit Risk, 1998, pages 1 - 442, John Wiley and Sons, Inc., U.S.A. | |
| | 87 | HALFORD, CRAEME, BAKER, ROSEMARY, BAIN, JOHN, "How many variables can a human process?" Psychological Science, January 2005, pages 73 - 76, V16, U.S.A. | |
| | 88 | LORH, STEVE, "Gates tries to inspire future leaders", March 2, 2005, page 19, International Herald Tribune, France | |
| | 89 | CLARK, PETER et al, "Knowledge entry as the graphical assembly of components", submitted to K-CAP 2001 October 2001, pages 1 - 8, Victoria BC, Canada | |
| | 90 | ALEXANDER, CAROL, Risk Management and Analysis, 1998, pages 1 - 275, John Wiley and Sons, U.S.A. | |

| | | | |
|-----------------------|---|-------------------|----------|
| Examiner Signature |  | Date Completed | 11/12/07 |
|-----------------------|---|-------------------|----------|

[illegible]

Appendix D Attachments

1. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 1997; 278: 1019-1024.

use assembly code as necessary.

Complete if Known

Application Number: 107046-034

| | |
|-------------|------------|
| Filing Date | 01/16/2019 |
|-------------|------------|

| | |
|----------------------|----------------|
| First Named Inventor | John C. Linder |
|----------------------|----------------|

| | |
|---------|------|
| Am Ue : | 3502 |
|---------|------|

| | |
|---------------|------------------|
| Exat 12:46:10 | Sufjet: Chenaruk |
|---------------|------------------|

| | |
|------------------------|----------|
| Aprone, Doctor 'Surge' | 362 - 50 |
|------------------------|----------|

NON PATENT LITERATURE DOCUMENTS

Source: City: State: Zip:
 Title:
 Author:
 Editor:
 Publisher:
 Date: Page(s):
 Volume: Issue:
 Number(s): City and/or country where published:

91 MYERS, RANDY, "Measure for Measure", November 1, 1997, pages 31 - 37, CFO Magazine, U.S.A.

BIDDLE, GARY; BOWEN, ROBERT; WALLACE, JAMES: "Does EVA Beat Earnings?" pages 301 - 335 V24, December 1997 *Journal of Accounting and Economics*, U.S.A.

H. UDENBRAND, "CAROL", "Building Two and Two Together", pages 1 - 8 January 2002
Darwin Magazine, U.S.A.

ROLL, RICHARD "A Micro-Variation Analysis of Trucking Losses", pages 13 - 22, Vol. 8, Summer 1932, *Journal of Portfolio Management*, U.S.A.

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left(\frac{1}{x^2} \right) = -\frac{2}{x^3}$$
$$x = 1.5 \times 10^{-4}$$
[illegible]

Under the Privacy Protection Act of 1974, no person has a right to a collection of information at any place containing a valid OMD permit, nor does

1495PTD

INFORMATION DISCLOSURE
STATEMENT BY APPLICANT

(Use 24 pins/rows as necessary)

13

 ϕ^2

Complete if Known

| | |
|----------------------|----------------------|
| Allocation Number | 10/C45,994 |
| Filing Date | 01/18/2032 |
| Filer Name/Inventor | Jeff S Eder |
| Att. Unit | 3692 |
| Examiner Name | S glirer, Chercinski |
| Agency/Jockey Number | AR - 42 |

U. S. PATENT DOCUMENTS

| Exam Fol to Date | Cite No | Document Number | Publication Date MM-DD-YY | Name of Patentee or Applicant of Choc Document | Pages, Columns, Lines Where Relevant Passages or Relevant Figures Appear |
|---------------------|------------|-----------------|------------------------------|---|--|
| | US | 6,332,163 - B1 | 12-18-2001 | Bowman-Amush, Vichel | |
| | US | 5,802,501 - B1 | 3-1-1998 | Graff, Richard A. | |
| | US | 6,839,304 - B1 | 6-13-1989 | Roberts et al | |
| | US | 6,148,283 - B1 | 11-14-2000 | Douglas L. King | |
| | US | 6,742,775 - B1 | 04-21-1998 | Douglas L. King | |
| | US | 5,802,501 - B1 | 08-01-1998 | Graff, Richard | |
| | US | 2002/0129034-A1 | 02-21-2002 | Brown et al | |
| | US | 2002/0052520-A1 | 05-02-2002 | Getto, Joseph | |
| | US | 2002/0025250-A1 | 01-03-2002 | Getto, Joseph | |
| | US | 2002/0016758-A1 | 02-07-2002 | Grissoy, Calvin | |
| | US | 6,158,911 - B1 | 2-13-2001 | Lim et al. | |
| | US | 6,209,124 - B1 | 3-27-2001 | Vannaire et al | |
| | US | 6,366,934 - B1 | 4-02-2002 | Cheng et al. | |
| | US | 6,282,531 - B1 | 8-28-2001 | Haighan et al | |
| | US | 6,758,733 - B1 | 5-18-2004 | Hogan, Michael | |
| | US | 5,774,573 - B1 | 03-29-1998 | Berent, Thomas | |
| | US | 5,794,219 - B1 | 08-11-1998 | Brown, Stephen | |
| | US | 5,888,591 - B1 | 03-29-1998 | Sriniani, Peter | |
| | US | 2003/0083973-A1 | 5-1-2003 | Hoffstall Peter | |

FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS

[illegible]

Shirley, 1994.

2008

[illegible][illegible]

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Emergency Reduction Act of 1992, no papers are required to be posted to a reduction of formal or unless it contains a valid CMR and a statement

9661198 [E, L, J, M, O, P, R, S, T, V, W, X, Y, Z]

Use as many sheets as necessary.

Sheet

4

Complete if Known

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------|
| Application Number | 10/046,094 |
| Filing Date | 1/16/2002 |
| First Named Inventor | Jeff S. Ecker |
| Att. No. | 3592 |
| Examiner Name | Sydney Chenchinski |
| Assignee/Client Number | AR - 44 |

| U. S. PATENT DOCUMENTS | | | | | |
|------------------------|--------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|---|--|
| Patent No. Patent # | Class No. | Document Name | Publication or Date Info CD-XXXX | Name of Publisher or Appoint of Class Document | Page, Column, Line, Where Relevant Passages or Relevant Figures Appear |
| | | US 6,301,564 - B | 10-09-2001 | Ranger, Dennis | |
| | US | 6,435,565 - B | 7-12-1994 | Benacerel, David M. | |
| | US | 6,542,420 - B1 | 8-06-1996 | Coleman et al | |
| | US | 6,951,300 - R1 | 9-14-1999 | Brown, Stephen J. | |
| | US | 6,985,559 - B1 | 11-16-1995 | Brown, Stephen J. | |
| | US | 6,014,825 - B | 11-11-2000 | Debrun-Ashton, D | |
| | US | 6,032,119 - B | 2-29-2000 | Brown et al | |
| | US | 6,221,008 - B1 | 2-24-2001 | Cot et al | |
| | US | 6,375,460 - B1 | 4-23-2002 | Brown, Stephen J. | |
| | US | 6,499,843 - B | 12-31-2002 | Cox et al | |
| | US | 6,510,430 - B1 | 1-21-2003 | Overwager et al | |
| | US | 6,518,056 - B | 2-11-2003 | Owos et al | |
| | US | 6,576,471 - B | 6-10-2003 | Owos | |
| | US | 6,612,986 - B | 9-2-2003 | Dei et al | |
| | US | 6,665,124 - B | 11-11-2003 | Clem, William | |
| | US | 6,695,795 - B | 2-24-2004 | Knos, Gard | |
| | US | 6,757,838 - B1 | 6-29-2004 | Isen et al | |
| | US | 6,884,204 - B1 | 1-27-2004 | Lai, Amrish K. | |
| | US | 6,854,288 - B1 | 11-25-2003 | Brunheroto et al | |

[illegible]

2011年12月15日

D.16
 C.109 3rd 5th

10. *Agreement* is a word or phrase that indicates that the speaker or writer agrees with the proposition. It can be a single word or a phrase, and it can be used in a variety of contexts. For example, the word "yes" is a common agreement word, and the phrase "I agree" is also used. Agreement can also be expressed by a nod of the head or a smile. In some cases, agreement can be expressed by a specific word or phrase, such as "I agree with you" or "I agree that...". Agreement is an important part of communication, as it allows people to express their views and opinions and to show that they understand and accept what others are saying.

U.S. citizens and dual citizen's required to file OF 1042 and 1043. The information is required to adjust a nation's liability for its citizens based on the amount of the RPTO is processed, an equivalent. Considerable time is consumed by the U.S.C. 102 and 103 OF 1042. This information is submitted in two 200,000 to complete, including primary, property, and submitting the completed application to the USPTO. Time varies depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of the RPTO can be completed by the form and/or suggested for forwarding to the border, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, P.O. Box 1463 Alexandria, VA 22304-1463. OR FOR 1042 OF 1043 OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Revenue, P.O. Box 1260, Alexandria, VA 22304-1260.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9102 (7-624-766 x199) and ask for option 2.

